

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 669

JC 770 484

AUTHOR Shanahan, John J.; And Others
TITLE Statewide Community College Services.
INSTITUTION Michigan State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges, Lansing.
PUB DATE Jul 77
NOTE 41p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Articulation (Program); *Board of Education Policy; *College Role; Community Colleges; Continuous Learning; Developmental Programs; Educational History; Faculty Development; General Education; *Junior Colleges; Open Enrollment; Remedial Instruction; State Boards of Education; State Departments of Education; *Statewide Planning; Tuition; Vocational Education; Vocational Education Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *Michigan

ABSTRACT

This document reviews the development of comprehensive community colleges in Michigan and sets forth recommended State Board of Education policies and Michigan Department of Education proposals to support and implement them. Issues addressed include open access, low tuition, geographical barriers, occupational education, general education, developmental/remedial education, continuing education, professional development of occupational education instructors, and articulation. (DC)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED144669

JC 770 484

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thomas E. Johnston

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

STATEWIDE COMMUNITY COLLEGE SERVICES

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

STATE BOARD FOR PUBLIC
COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

JULY 1977

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Term Expires

Dr. Edmund F. Vandette, <i>President</i>	
Houghton.....	Jan. 1, 1981
Annetta Miller, <i>Vice President</i>	
Huntington Woods.....	Jan. 1, 1979
Barbara Roberts Mason, <i>Secretary</i>	
Lansing.....	Jan. 1, 1983
Dr. Gumecindo Salas, <i>Treasurer</i>	
East Lansing.....	Jan. 1, 1985
John Watanen, Jr., <i>NASBE Delegate</i>	
Marquette.....	Jan. 1, 1985
Barbara Dumouchelle	
Grosse Ile.....	Jan. 1, 1979
Dr. Paul B. Henry	
Grand Rapids.....	Jan. 1, 1983
Norman Otto Stockmeyer, Sr.	
Westland.....	Jan. 1, 1981

Ex-Officio Members

William G. Milliken	Dr. John W. Porter
<i>Governor</i>	<i>Superintendent of Public Instruction</i>

STATE BOARD FOR PUBLIC COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES

Term Expires

Dr. John A. McLean, Jr., <i>Chairperson</i>	
Detroit.....	Jan. 31, 1981
Dr. Alfred V. Meyers, <i>Vice-Chairperson</i>	
West Bloomfield.....	Jan. 31, 1983
Shirley A. Collier, <i>Secretary</i>	
Grand Rapids.....	Jan. 31, 1981
Dr. Gladys Beckwith	
Lansing.....	Jan. 31, 1985
Charles A. Boyer	
Manistee.....	Jan. 31, 1983
David D. Diehl	
Dansville.....	Jan. 31, 1985
Norman G. Mackay	
Livonia.....	Jan. 31, 1979
Dr. Peter Oppewall	
Grand Rapids.....	Jan. 31, 1979

Ex-Officio Member, Dr. John W. Porter, *Superintendent of Public Instruction*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to acknowledge the contributions that the members of the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges made to the preparation of this document. They have devoted several meetings to the document, and have provided the staff of the Department of Education with direction for the preparation of the document.

On behalf of the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges, recognition is given to Dr. John J. Shanahan, Dr. Andrew Mazzara, and Mr. Thomas Johnston for the coordination, organization, and preparation of the document.

John A. McLean
Chairperson
State Board for Public Community
and Junior Colleges

INTRODUCTION

Enclosed are the recommended State Board of Education policies regarding public community and junior colleges and Michigan Department of Education proposals to support and implement the policy recommendations. The development and implementation of these policies and proposals, on advice of the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges, is an essential function of the State Board of Education as mandated by the 1963 Constitution of the State of Michigan.

Several reasons underlie the need for a review of community and junior college policies by the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges and by the State Board of Education. The Community College Board's 1967 Position Paper and the 1969 State Plan for Higher Education, which were both issued over ten years ago, need to be reviewed and updated in order to continue to provide a basis for legislative action and Department of Education proposals for the provision of community college services. Also, many important educational and social-economic factors have emerged during recent years such as projected enrollment decline, energy conservation, and non-traditional students to mention just a few of the influences which must be accounted for in State Board of Education policy and in the recommended proposals of the Department.

The policies have been developed from analysis of the historical involvement of community and junior college services in the State of Michigan, recognition of the role and responsibilities of the local Boards of Trustees, and by examination of contemporary views regarding the comprehensive community college concept. It is the intent of the Department of Education that the recommended policies and supporting proposals will provide a basis for improving and directing change for community and junior college instruction and services.

John A. McLean, Jr.
Chairperson
State Board for Public Community
and Junior Colleges

John W. Porter
Superintendent
of
Public Instruction

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART

Introduction	i
Glossary of Selected Terms	v
I-Development of the Comprehensive Community College Concept	1
Policy Statement	5
Proposal	6
II-Access and the Open Door	7
Institutional Access - <u>Issue No. 1</u>	9
Policy Statement	9
Proposal	10
Low Tuition - <u>Issue No. 2</u>	10
Policy Statement	12
Proposal	12
Geographical Barriers - <u>Issue No. 3</u>	13
Policy Statement	14
III-Comprehensive Program of Instruction	15
Occupational Education	16
Planning and Coordination - <u>Issue No. 4</u>	16
Policy Statement	17
Proposal	17
Comprehensive Employment and Training Act and Occupational Education - <u>Issue No. 5</u>	18
Policy Statement	19
Proposal	19
Professional Development - <u>Issue No. 6</u>	19
Policy Statement	20
Proposal	20
Articulation of Instruction - <u>Issue No. 7</u>	21
Policy Statement	22
Proposal	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

<u>PART</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
III-Comprehensive Program of Instruction (continued)	
General Education	22
Role Definition of General Education - <u>Issue No. 8</u>	23
Policy Statement	24
Proposal	24
Developmental-Remedial Education	25
Basic Program of Developmental Education - <u>Issue No. 9</u>	26
Policy Statement	26
Proposal	27
Continuing Education--Function, Organization, and Funding of Continuing Education and Community Services - <u>Issue No. 10</u>	28
Policy Statement	28
Proposal	28
IV-Finance	29
Develop and implement a sensitive funding procedure for comprehensive community colleges - <u>Issue No. 11</u>	30
Policy Statement	30
Proposal	31
References	33

GLOSSARY OF SELECTED TERMS

Access

Access to community college instruction and services, aside from the open door concept, relates to the geographic availability and location of such instruction and services to Michigan residents.

Community Service

Community service is generally defined as instruction or activities designed to meet non-academic and non-degree social, cultural, and educational needs, including community development, problem solving, resource sharing, personal development, and counseling services.

Continuing Education

Continuing education is generally defined as organized instruction designed to meet the needs of residents, employers, and organizations in the college service area.

Developmental Education

Instruction designed to improve or overcome any marked deficiency, including a deficiency in content previously taught, but not learned.

General Education

Instruction designed to prepare students for life roles as citizens, family members, workers and consumers in our democratic and pluralistic society.

Occupational Education

Instruction designed to provide the student with job skills necessary for employment or required for retraining or advancement in one's present occupation. This form of education is for occupations categorized as semi-skilled, skilled (including apprenticeable trades), technical and semi-professional. Occupations generally requiring a baccalaureate or higher degree for entry are not part of this form of education.

Open Door (access)

The open door concept is interpreted to mean an institutional policy that permits any person who has a secondary school diploma or equivalent or who is over eighteen years of age to enroll in a program consistent with the person's abilities and interests.

PART I - DEVELOPMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE
COMMUNITY COLLEGE CONCEPT

In 1975, there were 29 publicly supported community and junior colleges in Michigan enrolling 197,199 (1, p.18) students on a full and part-time basis. These enrollments account for 42 percent of the total enrolled in public institutions of higher education in Michigan. The State support for the operation of the institutions during the 1977 fiscal year amounted to slightly over \$101 million, with local tax revenues, student tuition and fees, federal and other sources matching or slightly exceeding the State contribution. The number of institutions, enrollments, and degree of State and local support for these services provided by the institutions have been increasing dramatically over the past 60 years. A brief review of the major events surrounding community college development in Michigan provides a foundation for planning the future.

Grand Rapids Junior College, established in 1914, was the first publicly supported two-year college in Michigan. A total of nine "junior" colleges were established as part of school districts by 1940. The singular purpose of these junior colleges as envisaged by the early supporters such as Henry Tappan, former president of the University of Michigan, and William Rainey Harper, first president of the University of Chicago, was to provide the first two years of a baccalaureate program, thus relieving the university of the responsibility for freshman and sophomore levels of instruction. Although freshmen and sophomore level instruction continues to be a function of public two-year colleges, the mission of these institutions has been broadened to address other social and economic needs

of persons in their communities.

In 1947, the President's Commission on Higher Education brought the concept of "community junior colleges" to the attention of the citizenry and educators when the Commission defined the community college as:

Whatever form the community college takes, its purpose is educational service to the entire community, and this purpose requires a variety of functions and programs. It will provide college education for the youth of the community, so as to remove geographical and economic barriers to educational opportunities and discover individual talents at low cost and easy access. In addition, the community college will attempt to meet the total post-secondary school needs of its community. (2)

The comprehensive community college concept implemented in Michigan is founded upon three basic elements: (1) equal access to educational services for all persons in the community, (2) the removal of geographic and economic barriers which prohibit persons from benefiting from the services, and (3) the reasonable opportunity for the individual to discover and develop his or her talent's at low cost. The current perspective of comprehensive service which community colleges presently adhere to has evolved over the past thirty years.

Public involvement in the development of the comprehensive community college concept came in the form of activities and reports such as: Educational Policies Commission of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1951-56; the Governor's Commission on Community and Junior Colleges, 1956-58; and particularly staff study number one, Community Colleges in Michigan, and others developed by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction in cooperation with the Michigan Council of Community College Administrators. The Michigan Constitution of 1963 and Public Acts 193 and 287 of 1964, and Act

331 of 1966 are significant in terms of cementing in place the contemporary concepts of community college services and the mechanism for the delivery of these services as we know them today.

The Constitution of the State of Michigan of 1963 provided for a State Board of Education whose duties include "leadership and general supervision over all public education . . ." and conducting general planning and coordination, which includes advising the legislature as to the financial requirements in connection therewith (3). The Constitution also created a State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges for the purpose of advising the State Board of Education concerning general supervision, planning and annual appropriations for support of the institutions. Further, it provides for locally elected Boards which supervise and control the college (3).

Comprehensive community college services have been defined and enunciated numerous times, and yet there seems to be some question of acceptance or understanding of the meaning of the concept. The services were outlined in the Report of the Citizens Committee on Higher Education, March 1965, and the Community College Act, Public Act 331 of 1966. A position paper by the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges (revised August 1967) is one of the definitive State documents that articulates the role, scope and mission of community and junior colleges. Portions of the paper are presented here for the purpose of establishing a background for the remainder of the paper. The document states the role of the institution is as follows:

--Citizens in all geographical areas within the State shall have access to community college programs and be included in an appropriate district structure; and

--All community college districts shall be so established, so operated and so financed as to provide high quality training and instruction, optimum student services, adequate plant, adequate enrollment and equipment at a minimum cost to the student and his family" (4, p.6).

The position paper articulates the scope and mission of the institution as:

1. Each community college shall adhere to an "open door" policy within its respective district to permit any qualified person, young or old, to enter or re-enter into available programs in pursuit of further study or training if so motivated.
2. Organized programs of personal services, guidance and conseling must be an important and an accepted part of the responsibilities of a community college. Students must be informed of all available opportunities. Such services should help students to make appropriate educational and vocational plans and choices; to orient them in the community college areas; to evaluate their abilities, aptitudes, and interests; to select and transfer upward or laterally in programs; and to resolve problems of admissions, finances, health, and other personal matters.
3. Differences in community college programs are to be expected and encouraged. However, this must be accompanied by a flexible and realistic policy of student enrollment reciprocity between community college districts. Such a policy of enrollment reciprocity should make it possible for students who qualify for specialized community college programs to enroll in such programs regardless of their residence. Further, it is recognized that some courses can more efficiently and economically be provided in one or two locations in the State, and State policy should effectuate this intent to minimize unnecessary duplication of cost and effort. Under this policy, costs to the non-resident student should not be significantly greater than the cost to the resident district student. Perhaps one method that could be used to cover the cost difference would be a charge-back to the sending district.

In addition, there must be a specific delineation between two-year institution programs and four-year institution programs. Associate degree programs or programs completed in two years or less should not be offered at the four-year institutions unless specifically approved by the State Board of Education. (NOTE: Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 112, adopted by the Michigan Senate on June 30, 1967, and by the Michigan House of Representatives on July 8, 1967, states "... that the boards of control of the State's public four-year colleges and universities be directed to cooperate in offering only those associate degree or occupational-technical programs which will not compete with or weaken programs being offered by the public community and junior colleges ...").

4. The State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges, in order to advise the State Board of Education in planning for the orderly development of higher education, will review all new community college programs. Such new programs will be reviewed among other reasons to avoid uneconomical duplication with similar programs of relatively low enrollment in neighboring districts. Specific courses, within programs, will be determined by the institution. Based on thorough and objective study, including consultation with local advisory boards and a statewide approach, recommendations will then be made regarding the location of various unique programs.

5. A statewide plan for the establishment and development of community colleges and community college districts must have the adaptability and flexibility that will provide the most efficient solution to problems arising from population and transportation disparities relative to educational needs. For example, in sparsely settled areas, where long distances are involved, dormitories permitting resident students, mobile classrooms, traveling teams of instructors, and busing of students - all should receive consideration and evaluation. In urban areas of dense population and relatively rapid transportation, a district involving several coordinated campuses should receive the same careful consideration and evaluation.
6. Vocational/technical, occupational education must have its initial beginnings early enough in the secondary school program to permit close integration and coordination through the late high school years and into the community college program.
7. Because of the distinctive philosophy and service of the community college toward specialized community education and training, a governing board separate from that of the secondary and elementary school district should be considered in every community college district not so governed. Those several districts now operating community colleges under K-12 school boards should be encouraged to initiate comprehensive studies toward establishing separate governing boards as soon as possible. The State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges recognizes that there are, in these K-12 community college operations, unique situation and problems that must be resolved. Consideration should be given by the State to allow use of previous capital investment by these K-12 community colleges as matching funds in any evolving district.
8. A community college should strive to enrich its total program not only through its adult and continuing education offerings, but also through cooperation with available community cultural resources (4, p. 7-11).

The 1967 position statement of the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges served as a foundation for State Board of Education policies and proposals as articulated in the 1969 State Plan for Higher Education, and for programs currently operating.

Policy Statement

It is the policy of the State Board of Education that all its policies, positions, and decisions affecting comprehensive community college services shall be done with the advice and assistance of the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges and after consultation with the local boards of the public community and junior colleges.

Proposal

The State Board of Education should continue to request the advice and assistance of the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges concerning general supervision, planning, and annual appropriations for the support of the institutions' services. This should include, but not be limited to:

--Institutional Access

- Open Door Admissions Policies
- Low Tuition
- Geographical Barriers

--Comprehensive Community College Programs

- Occupational Education
- General Education and the Liberal Arts
- Developmental Education
- Continuing and Community Service Education
- Professional Development

--Finance

PART II - ACCESS AND THE OPEN DOOR

BACKGROUND

Institutional Access

Regarding the issue of open access, the Carnegie Commission in its 1970 report, The Open Door Colleges, stated that public community colleges should admit all applicants who are high school graduates or persons over 18 years of age who are capable of benefiting from higher education programs. The Commission believed that without such open-admission policies, the community colleges would not provide equality of opportunity to the maximum extent possible, nor would they play the role that the Commission thought they should play in a universal access system (5, p.15).

The State Board of Education, in The State Plan for Higher Education in Michigan, reaffirmed its position that the community colleges should admit any high school graduate or other out-of-school person and counsel with him about the programs or courses from which he may benefit. The basis for the Board's position was the recognition of the particular responsibility borne by community colleges to ascertain the educational needs of the population they serve, and to construct programs that will encourage the admission of those needing or desiring higher education. The State Board of Education further recognized that community colleges must provide counseling services that will both help to determine curricular needs and assist applicants in determining the programs in which they have a reasonable chance for success (6, p.II - 26).

The State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges in 1971 adopted the following policy regarding open door admissions: The general

intent of an open door admissions policy is to enable any person eighteen years of age or beyond to enroll in, and complete a postsecondary education program if he so desires. It is important that such a program be consistent with the person's abilities and interests.

As a result of such a policy, a student would be given every opportunity to enroll in, and complete an educational program of benefit to him. Thus, in a majority of instances, the failure to complete a program will be the decision of the student rather than the result of permanent dismissal for academic nonperformance.

The following processes are basic to the implementation of an open door admissions policy.

1. Outreach process - This process emphasizes the need to inform all residents of a community college district about services available through the community college. Such a process will involve efforts to publicize community college opportunities, particularly in those areas of the district where large numbers of "non college-going" residents are located.
2. Entry Process - A community college will accept any resident of its district who is eighteen years of age or beyond or whose class has graduated and who desires to further his education. Individuals under eighteen years of age may be enrolled if considered appropriate by the community college. The entry process would be uncomplicated and the student would be assured that he has been admitted prior to the administration of any diagnostic or other type test.
3. In-depth diagnostic process - After the student has been admitted, students whose prior academic record suggests learning difficulties would be provided in-depth diagnostic services. If diagnostic procedures indicate that special assistance is needed, the student would be provided special counseling regarding the courses necessary to achieve his objectives. Such counseling should be available to the student as long as it is needed and should be reinforced by regular feed-back of the students' academic progress.
4. Catch-up instruction process - To assist those students with academic deficiencies, catch-up instruction would be available whether it is provided by the community college or is contracted with a secondary school. Similarly, students with academically deficient backgrounds would be provided counseling to discuss possible academic programs commensurate with their abilities. In addition, they would be counseled regarding alternatives available, the steps necessary to realize each of these alternatives, and the possible

consequences of their choice. However, a student would not be compelled to enter a program if he does not so desire. A student would not be denied the opportunity to enter a course which leads to a program deemed inconsistent with his ability. At the same time, it is recognized that a student's opportunity to enroll in a specific course of his choice will, of necessity, be limited in those high-cost technical courses for which only a small number of student stations are available.

6. Labeling process - The student with special academic needs would not be given a visible classification which suggests that he is not equal to other students. Further, the results of diagnosis and counseling would be privileged information and would be available only to authorized institutional personnel or upon request of the student.
7. Financial aids process - The lack of finances should not be an obstacle for any student to attend a community college.

ISSUES

Issue No. 1:

Open access combined with a strong commitment to developmental education is an essential element of the community college education process.

The State Plan for Higher Education noted that access to community college services is particularly critical for: (1) the high school dropout, (2) the adult who seeks additional education, or who is involved in a mid-career change, and (3) students who seek to transfer to baccalaureate institutions. The State Board of Education acknowledged that while the community colleges are committed to open access, the policy, the availability of developmental education which includes remedial education and counseling services, and admission practices vary among the institutions and, hence, influence the students' understanding of what course, program, and institutional alternatives are available and suited to the needs, interest, and ability of the students.

Policy Statement

Community and junior colleges should admit any high

school graduate or person eighteen years of age and any other out-of-school person and counsel with him or her about the programs or courses for which the student is prepared and may benefit (6, p.II-26).

Proposal

The State Board of Education should direct the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges to initiate studies and prepare recommendations in cooperation with the community college representatives directed at admission, retention and transfer policies and practices with particular emphasis on the following points:

- How is open access interpreted and implemented at each public community and junior college?
- How are the comprehensive instructional programs of occupational, general education, developmental and continuing education integrated with open access and transfer policies and practices at each public community and junior college?
- What are the transfer policies and practices and how do they work at each of the community and junior colleges?
- What are the transfer admission policies and practices at the baccalaureate institutions with respect to the public community colleges?

Issue No. 2:

Low tuition and what the concept represents require consideration.

The Carnegie Commission in several reports and studies has recommended that community colleges should charge no tuition or low tuition. The State Board

for Public Community and Junior Colleges supports as a policy objective the elimination of tuition and all fee charges to Michigan residents who attend public community and junior colleges. The Board recognizes that a no tuition policy represents a long-term and ultimate objective with respect to the removal of financial barriers to community college instruction and services for the citizens of Michigan. Until such time as the no tuition policy objective can be achieved, the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges will continue to support the concept of low tuition for community college education and direct its efforts to minimize tuition and fee charges born by Michigan's citizens. Therefore, as an interim approach, the issue suggested for consideration and study is low tuition, what is the intent of the concept, what it means to community colleges, their service areas, and that, in fact, it is a relative concept.

The State Board of Education has taken a leadership role in the garnering, provision and administration of student financial aid and assistance to insure that no citizen is prohibited from pursuing higher education for financial reasons. However, to the potential community college student, the issue is not what if any financial aid or assistance is available once enrolled, but rather, does the so-called "low tuition" represent a barrier significant enough to prevent the person from even considering applying for admission? Obviously what is perceived to be low tuition to one person may not be the case for another individual.

The non-district resident student who is forced to pay double the tuition of a resident student would probably not consider tuition as low. In some cases, it is less expensive for the non-district resident to attend a four-year college or university than to attend a community college. The significance of the low tuition concept is dramatized when one considers

that the majority of the students attending some community colleges are non-district residents. An examination of the concept of low tuition should be performed because of the relativity of the concept due to differences in average per capita incomes, labor market and economic conditions, district and non-resident tuition differential and tuition charges of four-year colleges and universities. The State Board of Education and the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges reaffirm their position that statewide districting to provide community college instruction and services to all Michigan residents at an in-district rate is the desired method for maintaining low tuition.

Policy Statement

Students should pay a minimum tuition which should be low so as to prevent it from becoming a financial barrier to community college attendance. No Michigan resident should pay more in tuition and fees when enrolled in a community college than if enrolled in a similar curriculum at a public supported baccalaureate institution in the same geographical area.

Proposal

The State Board of Education should direct the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges to study the concept of low tuition and fees as interpreted and applied to each of the public community

and junior colleges and their respective service areas, with special emphasis on the following points:

- How is the concept of low tuition and fees interpreted and implemented at each community college?
- How is the concept of low tuition and fees perceived by the residents of the service areas of each community and junior college?
- What are the implications for students, instructors and the State in terms of program planning, coordination and finance?
- What are the economic conditions or factors which influence the perception of tuition being low or representing a barrier?

These studies should have the following objectives: (a) to develop a state-level understanding and acceptance of the concept of low tuition, (b) to assist State agencies in the development of informational and assistance programs which are consistent with citizen and institutional needs, and (c) to promote the development criteria which help institutions and State agencies identify actual tuition and fee impact and significance.

Issue No. 3:

All persons should have access to community college services.

The third issue which directly relates to open access to community and junior colleges is the availability of such services to all residents of Michigan. The State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges and the State Board of Education have sought to extend community college services throughout the entire State. The State Board of Education in the 1969 State Plan for Higher Education in Michigan and in the Board's legislative efforts

have continually affirmed its belief that every resident of the State should have access to community college services. Several community college redistricting bills have been proposed and introduced by the Legislature which incorporate the Board's policy that all areas of the State be included in independent community college districts (6, p.III-40). The State Board of Education deemed it essential that community college campuses be located to serve the largest number of people and within the shortest commuting distance (6, P.III-40).

Policy Statement

Every resident of the State should have access to community college services. All geographical areas of the State should be included in independent community college districts and no Michigan resident should be subjected to non-resident or out-of-district tuition or fee charges at any community college the student elects to attend.

PART III - COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM OF INSTRUCTION

BACKGROUND

The open door concept is a fundamental principle of public community college education. It represents a belief held by many Americans that postsecondary education should be accessible to all persons who can benefit from higher education. Implementation of the open door concept requires community colleges to provide a comprehensive program of instruction designed to meet the varying needs, abilities and interests of students.

Michigan's public community and junior colleges are continually changing and expanding their program of instruction to meet the varying student demands - particularly those of non-traditional students who are entering in increasing numbers. Classified as non-traditional students are the chronically unemployed, the academically and socially disadvantaged, the physically handicapped, the elderly, persons with limited English speaking ability, and most recently, women who are heads of households and sole family supporters.

Each person enrolling in a community college has his or her own unique set of desires and capabilities. Community colleges are continually responding to the diverse needs of their students by offering courses and programs in each of the major educational functions: (1) occupational; (2) general education and liberal arts; (3) continuing, and (4) developmental education. These four functions are acknowledged by most authorities as constituting the basic elements of a comprehensive community college program. Each of Michigan's public two-year colleges, to varying degrees, is providing instructional services within each major function and continually striving to meet the diverse needs of the districts' constituents.

ISSUES

Occupational Education

Occupational education is generally defined as instruction designed to provide the student with job skills necessary for employment or required for retraining or advancement in one's present occupation. For administrative and state and federal funding purposes, occupational education usually pertains to occupations considered skilled and semi-skilled, technical, or semi-professional, and which generally do not require a baccalaureate or higher degree.

In 1965, the State Board of Education designated all Michigan public community colleges as postsecondary area vocational schools. This action assigned community colleges with the responsibility of providing postsecondary occupational education and made them eligible for federal assistance through the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the subsequent Amendments of 1968, and Title II of the Educational Amendments of 1976. Community colleges continually strive to fulfill their postsecondary occupational education responsibility as measured by the number of occupational programs and courses available to the community and by the number of students enrolled.

Issue No. 4:

Continued Statewide Planning and Coordination of public community college occupational education programs.

The State Board of Education must continue its efforts to plan and coordinate the orderly development of community college occupational education programs and facilities. Statewide planning and coordination is essential in order to prevent unnecessary duplication of programs and facilities and to make judicious use of state and federal financial resources.

The State Board of Education, with the advice of the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges, should review and approve new and existing occupational education programs to assure each program: (1) is organized appropriately according to identified student needs and employment opportunities, (2) has no adverse effect upon programs offered by other community colleges, (3) adheres to accepted educational standards of quality, and (4) is provided in a cost-efficient manner.

Policy Statement

In order to assure the orderly development of programs and facilities, and to promote cost-efficient, quality occupational education, the State Board of Education with the advice of the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges and the local boards of trustees will review and recommend new and existing programs and make state funding recommendations to the Legislature and the Governor.

Proposal

The State Board of Education direct the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges to continue with the development and implementation of procedures for the statewide planning and coordination of public community college occupational education programs. Procedures should interrelate the elements of new program planning and development and ongoing program evaluation and improvement. Data gathered during the implementation of procedures should pertain to: (1) employment opportunities for graduates; (2) the content, organization and physical environment of instruction; (3) cost and income; (4) coordination with other occupational and training programs; (5) personnel; (6) the appropriateness of instruction

in light of student needs and abilities. The analysis of such data should be in keeping with the decision-making needs of the local boards, State Boards, the Legislature, and the Executive Office.

Issue No. 5:

Coordination of community college occupational education and government sponsored manpower programs including the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (C.E.T.A.) programs.

During the next several years, the federal government is expected to increase substantially its financial assistance to the State's 23 prime sponsors to support training programs and income maintenance for unemployed and underemployed youth and adults. Monies allocated under Title I, Comprehensive Manpower Services, of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act may be used to support job training or public service employment. During the 1976 fiscal year, \$41.3¹ million of the \$83 million allocated to Michigan under Title I were used to support job training programs. It is estimated that the 1978 fiscal year appropriation to Michigan's 23 prime sponsors under Title I will approach \$95 million. It is projected that approximately 40 percent, or \$38 million of the appropriations will be used to support job training programs for adults. Approximately \$5 million of these funds may be used to support CETA programs in community colleges for eligible adults selected by prime sponsors. It is important, therefore, for prime sponsors and community colleges to coordinate their training programs.

The State Board of Education and the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges should promote close coordination of community college

¹Includes 39 percent of Title I funds used for job training and part of the 5 percent set aside for Department of Education-administered vocational training programs.

and prime sponsor training programs and discourage the unnecessary duplication of occupational training programs.

Policy Statement

In order to assure the orderly development of programs and facilities and to promote the cooperation of public agencies involved in manpower development, the State Board of Education and the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges will promote the coordination of community college and prime sponsor training programs and where adequate and accessible community college training facilities exist, prime sponsors and community colleges should establish contractual agreements for their joint use.

Proposal

The State Board of Education direct the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges to seek the cooperation of the Department of Labor and develop guidelines which can assist local prime sponsors and community colleges coordinate their training programs and maximize use of existing training facilities. The guidelines should consider the training capabilities, facilities, programs and trainee output of each local agency and should be developed in cooperation with representatives of public community colleges and prime sponsors.

Issue No. 6:

Professional development of community college occupational education instructors.

Occupational education programs in community colleges are constantly

increasing in scope and variety. The larger and more complex the labor market, the more varied the occupational curricula of the community colleges are likely to be.

During the past decade, the number and scope of Michigan's public community college occupational courses have increased substantially. In 1975-76, vocational-technical courses offered by Michigan's 29 public, two-year colleges enrolled an estimated 126,125 persons.

The specialized nature and purpose of occupational courses have required community colleges to employ instructors who have demonstrated expertise in course subject matter. Instructors are generally experts in their subject-matter field and many are former employees (or entrepreneurs) of organizations in business, the manufacturing and construction, health care and public service areas.

The State Board of Education on the advice of the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges should assure that persons enrolling in community colleges are taught by instructors who have acquired at least the minimum teaching skills required for success in the classroom.

Policy Statement

In order to assure acceptable quality of community college classroom and laboratory instruction, full and part-time occupational education instructors should successfully complete a program of organized pre-service or in-service instruction in the basic methods of teaching and classroom management.

Proposal

The State Board of Education direct the State

Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges to develop and initiate an in-service program for the professional development of community college occupational education instructors. The community colleges should determine the instructors who need assistance and who would benefit from a program of in-service training. The in-service program should include the concepts of program goal and objective setting, competency-test development, planning and implementing learning strategies, and assessing and recording student achievement. The in-service program should be developed and initiated in consultation with representatives of public community colleges and may be applicable to all areas of instruction.

Issue No. 7:

Articulation of occupational curricula among secondary schools, community colleges and baccalaureate institutions.

Forty-two area vocational education studies encompassing the entire State revealed few instances of high schools, community colleges, and baccalaureate institutions jointly planning and coordinating their occupational curricula. This lack of curriculum articulation results in the duplication of learning experiences and overlapping curricula in high schools, area centers and colleges.

The increasing cost of education to students and taxpayers makes improvement of articulation practices a necessity. Development of secondary area vocational centers and the changing role of community colleges and many four-year colleges have emphasized the need for improved curriculum articulation in Michigan. The State Board of Education has approved a planning document entitled, Planning for Continuous Occupational Education Between Secondary and Postsecondary Education, which contains recommendations designed to assure that students moving through the educational system may do so in an efficient and rewarding manner.

Policy Statement

Students moving through the various stages of occupational education shall do so without the loss of credit and the needless repetition of learning experiences.

Proposal

The State Board of Education direct the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges to assess the nature and extent of current articulation efforts among public educational agencies pertaining to occupational education. Local efforts which are judged successful should be considered exemplars and shared among educational agencies for possible adoption or adaptation. Special projects should be initiated to increase the number of schools and colleges participating in occupational education articulation and to expand the scope of programs included in existing articulation efforts.

General Education

"General" education is often defined as instruction designed to prepare students for the common activities of men and women as citizens, family members, workers and consumers in our democratic and pluralistic society. However, of the major curriculum functions of the comprehensive community college, "general" education is the most difficult to describe. Each person who discusses the specifics of this elusive entity usually does so in terms of a program with which he or she is immediately identified. Thus, under the broad umbrella of "general" education are traditional liberal arts courses such as "English Literature" and contemporary courses such as "Chemistry for the Consumer", each of which is viewed by its proponent as

a legitimate offering under the description of general education. This broad interpretation of acceptable offerings is an indicator of the lack of agreement among community college educators regarding the purpose, structure, and content of general education. In some community colleges, general education is viewed as the liberal arts and science courses designed primarily for persons enrolled in preprofessional programs. In others, general education is constituted of special basic foundation courses in the arts, humanities, communications, and the social and physical sciences. These general education programs of widely varying structures and content all purport to achieve the same educational objectives.

Issue No. 8:

Development of a role definition of general education and clarification of its relationship to student needs.

Although general education is universally accepted as one of the fundamental missions of the community college, most persons have difficulty defining its specific purposes, structure, and basic content. General education is too often defined by what it is not. In the view of many, general education is any offering which is nonvocational, nonprofessional and nondevelopmental in nature. Those involved in the administration of community college programs have come to define general education as instructional activities which do not qualify for federal categorical grants or higher levels of State school aid.

The need to define the contemporary role of general education is crucial since most community college students are pursuing course work classified under this curriculum function. It is estimated that nearly 40 percent of full-time community college students are enrolled in preprofessional programs composed primarily of general education course offerings.

Further, most occupational education students are required by local institutional policies to satisfy certain general education requirements in order to obtain an associate degree. In light of the lack of consensus regarding the purpose, structure, and content of community college general education, the State Board of Education with the advice of the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges should provide leadership in defining this function relative to student needs and promote guidelines which specify relationships among general education and the other curriculum functions of the comprehensive community college.

Policy Statement

The State Board of Education and the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges shall continue to support the general education offerings of public community colleges and encourage all studies which aim at producing responsible members of a democratic society. The general education offerings of each college should be in keeping with the perceived life role needs of students and in support of their specific educational objectives as determined by their local boards of trustees.

Proposal

The State Board of Education direct the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges, in cooperation with representatives of Michigan's public community colleges, to conduct an assessment of general education to determine: (1) its contemporary role in assisting students achieve important life role competencies; and (2) the means by which it can support the specific educational objectives of occupational, preprofessional, and continuing education students.

Developmental Education

Developmental education is defined as instruction designed to improve or overcome any marked deficiency, including a deficiency in content previously taught but not learned. This form of education is characterized as having three purposes: (1) to alleviate discrepancies between those educational skills previously taught but not learned (remedial); (2) the removal of deficiencies of knowledge in order to qualify for instruction for which the student was previously ineligible, and (3) the development of positive attitudes toward learning, working, and others.

The community college, through its open door admissions policy, enhances the democratic concepts of individual worth and educational opportunity for all persons. High school graduation or the equivalent is the criterion that the colleges generally adhere to in admitting persons to the institution. This admissions policy has resulted in a heterogeneous student population which includes the "low achiever" or "high risk" student, who might not otherwise have access to an institution of higher education. This type of student, combined with traditional methods of instruction and academic standards, has resulted in instances of high student attrition rate. Critics of the community college open door admissions policy frequently cite high student attrition rates and the number of students who fail to complete programs or who receive "low" or "no" course grades as a basis for curtailing the open door policy. This view has lead some persons to refer to the "open door" policy as the "revolving door" and are critical of institutions who fail to help those needing education the most. Only if students succeed in achieving their educational objective will the open door admissions policy and the concept of access be fully realized.

Issue No. 9:

A basic program of developmental education.

Community colleges have found it necessary to institute developmental instruction. The success of the colleges' efforts at remediation and attitude development have been the subject of numerous national studies.

John Roueche, a noted author in the field, concludes after a review of related literature:

"1. There is a pronounced lack of research on the effectiveness of remediation efforts in community colleges in terms of assessing academic performance, persistence, and attitudes of high-risk students.

2. Even with the dearth of research, the evidence indicates that remedial courses and programs in two-year colleges, and in all of higher education for that matter, have largely been ineffective in remedying student deficiencies.

3. There is an increasing number of critics of the open door college and its implied promise to provide successful learning experiences for all its students. Focus of criticism seems divided between the over-zealous aims of the junior college and the reluctance of the institution to evaluate its efforts (7, p.7-8)."

The State Board of Education and the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges should take the initiative and with the cooperation of community colleges, develop a basic program of Developmental Education.

The basic program should include remedial instruction and attitudinal development which is in keeping with the specific educational objectives of students.

Policy Statement

Community colleges should promote the policy of open door admissions and provide adequate developmental education related to the specific educational objectives and abilities of potential students. Adequate developmental instruction and attitude development activities should be provided under the supervision of qualified professionals.

Proposal

The State Board of Education direct the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges to cooperate with institutional representatives to identify exemplary methods and techniques for assessing student deficiencies and remediating these deficiencies. Further, proposals should be developed which will serve as incentives to the institution to implement the exemplary methods and to the Legislature to fund their efforts.

Continuing and Community Service Education

Continuing education and community service are recognized functions of the community college. Continuing education is generally defined as organized instruction designed to meet the needs of residents, employers, and organizations in the college service area. Community service is generally defined as instruction or activities designed to meet non-academic and non-degree social, cultural, and educational needs, including community development, problem solving, resource sharing, personal development, and counseling services.

The strategies designed by the institutions to deliver these types of education have taken as many shapes. The administrative organization patterns of the institutions reflect the judgments of the institutions as to what they consider the most effective means of providing instruction on a continuing basis. Public support of this type of education is in question. The funding of avocational and leisure-time courses which constitute a large portion of some community colleges' continuing education programs has been reduced, and it has been recommended that funding be eliminated in 1977-78.

Issue No. 10:

The function, organization and funding of continuing education.

Policy Statement

Continuing education and community services are educational activities which the community college should provide in response to the community's needs.

Proposal

The State Board of Education direct the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges, in cooperation with community college representatives, to initiate studies and prepare recommendations regarding the function, structure, and financing of continuing and community service education.

The studies should answer such questions as:

- What forms and types of activities constitute continuing education?
- What should the relationship be between schools and colleges offering continuing education in the same or adjoining areas?
- What financial contribution should the State, student and/or local taxpayer provide in support of these activities?
- What techniques and/or methods could be developed that direct the extent to which the services are being performed in relationship to the citizenry of the community?

PART IV - FINANCE

BACKGROUND

Finance

The State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges, in a position paper addressing issues raised in the Report of the Task Force to Implement Senate Bill 1346, stated that the primary responsibility for the operation and establishment of community colleges lies with the State. The State Board of Education, recognizing that the educational programs of community colleges vary widely and that some colleges are penalized by the standard per student appropriation, recommend that a new method of determining appropriations for community college operations be developed consistent with their roles as institutions of higher education. The development of a new method of determining operation appropriations must be consistent with the State Board's policy that the Legislature should appropriate sufficient funds for adequately providing for the general operating purposes of community and junior colleges.

The present method of financing community colleges is a foundation based program. This is a method of State and local sharing of current educational costs that emphasizes evening out the differences in a community's fiscal ability to support a community college. In the foundation method, similar to elementary-secondary State support, the State sets a certain number of dollars per FTE as representing the amount of foundation necessary for an adequate community college program (different numbers of dollars are set for different program classifications). The amount of the budget **guaranteed** by the State is equal to the foundation amount per FTE times the FTE of the college. From this is deducted the amount raised by the local tax rate and the income from tuition. The remainder is supplied

by the State.

In recent years, the foundation program method of community college finance has been criticized for various reasons, some of which are: 1) the use of FTE students as a measure of need may inhibit the offering of innovative programs where costs are not reflected in the FTE's they generate; 2) the provision of a set amount per FTE student as the foundation for all tends to have the effect of nudging the colleges toward uniformity; 3) aside from enrollment limitations imposed by the State, there is a strong incentive to increase the number of FTE students because up to the amount of the foundation guarantee, additional students are fully funded by the State with no additional local funding effort required; and 4) there is little incentive for comprehensive statewide planning and coordination.

Issue No. 11:

Develop and implement a sensitive funding procedure for comprehensive community college services.

In response to the need for developing a more efficient and sensitive procedure for determining State appropriations for community college operating needs, the Legislature, the Executive Office, the institutions and the Department of Education have supported and worked cooperatively to develop a performance criterion approach to meet community college operating requirements.

Policy Statement

The State Board of Education and the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges support the development and implementation of a performance criterion method of determining State appropriated support for community and junior college operating needs.

Further, that the Department of Education will assist the Legislature, the Executive Office, and the colleges in the evaluation of the proposed funding mechanism to insure that it provides sufficient funds for adequately meeting the general operating purposes of the community and junior colleges.

Proposal

The State Board of Education direct the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges to develop and apply criteria for evaluating the proposed criterion based method of community college finance. The following are proposed criteria that could be used to evaluate the funding model:

1. The finance program should enhance, rather than impede, the ability of the community college to serve those who find access to traditional institutions difficult.
2. It should enhance, rather than impede, the ability of the community colleges to provide courses and programs not provided, or provided insufficiently, by the four-year institutions.
3. It should enhance, not impede, the ability of the community college to respond to the particular needs of the community it serves, and in some cases statewide programs.
4. The possible effect of the finance program upon the health and independence of the private sector of higher education, both two-year and four-year should be considered.

5. The finance program should help to prevent unnecessary duplication among institutions, and among the levels of education; secondary schools; community colleges; area vocational schools, liberal arts colleges and universities.
6. The finance program should encourage the various colleges to operate their own programs efficiently.
7. The finance program should provide equity to the students of the colleges.
8. The finance program should provide equity to the taxpayers who support it.

REFERENCES

1. Michigan Department of Education: 1975-76 Fact Book on Higher Education in Michigan, Lansing, Michigan, July, 1976.
2. President's Commission on Higher Education: Higher Education for American Democracy, New York, Harper and Brothers: 1947.
3. Constitution of the State of Michigan, Article VIII, Sections 3 and 7, 1963.
4. State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges: A Position Paper by the State Board for Public Community and Junior Colleges, Lansing, Michigan, August, 1967.
5. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education: The Open-Door Colleges, New York, McGraw-Hill: June, 1970.
6. Michigan Department of Education: State Plan for Higher Education in Michigan, Lansing, Michigan, 1970.
7. Roueche, John E. and R. Wake Kirk: Catching Up: Remedial Education, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass: 1973.
8. Garms, Walter I., Financing Community Colleges. New York: Teachers College Press, 1977.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 18 1977

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES